

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's Office Action dated March 24, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; and rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami (US 6,812,631) in view of Kobayashi (US 4,893,054).

#### **Amendments to the Specification**

In the specification, the paragraph beginning at page 7, line 11, which starts with "The upper mold", has been amended to correct clerical errors. The amendment is clearly supported by the disclosure appearing on page 6, lines 11 to 13 of the specification, and also by the priority document (#10-2002-0046460) of the present application appearing on page 7, line 20 to page 8, line 2 of the original specification (see page 8, lines 20-24 of the attached certified translation of the priority document).

#### **Amendments to the Claims**

In order to overcome the Examiner's 112 rejections, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the units of the claimed equation " $T1+10 \leq H \leq Dx0.12$ " are in millimeters, as suggested by the Examiner in item 1 on page 2 of the Official Action. The fact that the unit of 10 is in millimeters (mm) is clearly supported by the disclosure appearing on **page 7, lines 19 to 24 of the original**, and therefore no new matter is involved.

Accordingly, it is believed that the above amendments made to the claims have removed the grounds for the 112 rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,812,631 (Murakami) and 4,893,054 (Kobayashi) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that:

1. The Murakami patent is not a proper reference since the filing date of the Murakami patent is after the effective filing date of the present application (which is supported by the attached verified translation of the priority document); and
2. the Kobayashi patent discloses or suggests, whether considered individually or in combination with any of the other references of record, a CRT having the claimed relationship between inner and outer curvature radii, and thickness and height of the faceplate.

By way of review, the present inventions are directed to a slim flat panel which has a minimized skirt portion to reduce the total depth of a CRT while satisfying the UL standards for implosion proof. The rejections are respectfully traversed on the grounds that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the following positively recited features:

- a. A CRT in which, when an average outer curvature radius R1 and an average inner curvature radius R2 of the faceplate are equal to or greater than 10,000 mm, an overall height H of the faceplate satisfies the relationship of  $T1 + 10(\text{mm}) \leq H \leq D \times 0.12$ ;
- b. A CRT in which the face center thickness T1 and a seal thickness T2

satisfy the relationships of  $D \times 0.02 \leq T1 \leq D \times 0.037$ ,  $D \times 0.014 \leq T2 \leq D \times 0.026$  respectively.

The Examiner pointed out that the present inventions are unpatentable over Murakami in view of Kobayashi. However, Murakami is not a proper prior art reference with respect to the present application because Murakami's US filing date of September 25, 2002, postdates the present application's priority date, August 7, 2002. Accordingly, a certificated translation of the prior document, Korean Application No. 2004-0046460 filed August 7, 2002, is being concurrently submitted to perfect the claim to priority in the present application. Therefore, the obviousness rejection in view of Murakami should be withdrawn.

As to the Kobayashi patent, it discloses a color cathode ray tube which includes a face panel and a color selecting shadow mask. Specially, Kobayashi discloses, as the Examiner kindly pointed out, that the outer surface of the panel is made flat and the inner curvature radius of the panel is equal to or greater than 10,000 mm in order to prevent a color blurring which tends to occur at a peripheral area of the screen. However, Kobayashi is different from the present inventions as follows:

First, the composition of Kobayashi is totally different from that of the present invention. The present invention is based on a the relationship among T1, H and D which is  $T1 + 10(\text{mm}) \leq H \leq D \times 0.12$ , and also on the relationships among T1, T2, D which are  $D \times 0.02 \leq T1 \leq D \times 0.037$ ,  $D \times 0.014 \leq T2 \leq D \times 0.026$  respectively (page 6, lines 6-15, page 9, lines 6-14). In contrast, Kobayashi discloses only he relationship among the radii of curvature RD, RH and RV

(RD>RH>RV) and the relationship of the screen pitch PS at each point of the faceplate, but is totally silent on the relationship among T1, T2, H and D.

In addition, Kobayashi has totally different objectives from those of the present inventions. The present invention seeks to reduce the total depth of a CRT while satisfying the UL standards for implosion resistance, whereas Kobayashi seeks to provide a press-moldable color cathode ray tube whose faceplate is integrated with a skirt in order to improve productivity.

As stated above, Murakami is an improper reference because its U.S. filing date is after the earliest priority date of the present application, and Kobayashi does not show, independently or in combination, the inventive features of the present inventions as set forth in the claims 1 and 2. According, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 and 2 define a patentable invention over Kobayashi; and are, therefore, allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that this is a full and complete response to the Office Action. For the reasons discussed above, applicant now respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in complete condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejections be withdrawn; and that the claims 1 and 2 be allowed in their present form. If the Examiner feels that any issues that remain require discussions, he is kindly invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims an/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects, in order to place the case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendment or correction be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case be passed to issue.

Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Urcia', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA

Registration No. 33,805

Date: June 23, 2005

Appl. No. 10/632,926  
Amendment dated  
Reply to OA of March 24, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500